

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
WACO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	§	
	§	
vs.	§	NO: WA:06-CR-00124(1)-ADA
	§	
(1) WALTER RANDALE RAMOS	§	

ORDER ACCEPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Before the court is the above styled and numbered cause. On May 2, 2025 the United States Probation Office filed a Petition For Warrant or Summons For Offender Under Supervision for Defendant (1) WALTER RANDALE RAMOS, which alleged that Ramos violated a condition of his supervised release and recommended that Ramos's supervised release be revoked (Clerk's Document No. 119). A warrant issued and Ramos was arrested. On May 7, 2025, Ramos appeared before a United States Magistrate Judge, was ordered detained, and a revocation of supervised release hearing was set.

Ramos appeared before the magistrate judge on May 13, 2025, waived his right to a preliminary hearing and to be present before the United States District Judge at the time of modification of sentence, and consented to allocution before the magistrate judge. Following the hearing, the magistrate judge signed his report and recommendation on May 14, 2025, which provides that having carefully considered all of the arguments and evidence presented by the Government and Defendant, based on the original offense and

the intervening conduct of Ramos, the magistrate judge recommends that this court revoke Ramos supervised release and that Ramos be sentenced to imprisonment for TWELVE (12) months, with no term supervised release to follow the term of imprisonment, and with credit for time-served. Finally, it is RECOMMENDED that Defendant be placed at the Bureau of Prison facility in either Bastrop or Forth Worth if possible (Clerk's Document No. 131).

A party may serve and file specific, written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge within fourteen days after being served with a copy of the report and recommendation, and thereby secure a *de novo* review by the district court. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). A party's failure to timely file written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation in a report and recommendation bars that party, except upon grounds of plain error, from attacking on appeal the unobjected-to proposed factual findings and legal conclusions accepted by the district court. *Douglass v. United Services Auto Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415 (5th Cir. 1996) (*en bane*). The parties in this cause were properly notified of the consequences of a failure to file objections.

On May 13, 2025, following the hearing on the motion to revoke supervised release, all parties signed a Waiver Of Fourteen Day Rule For Filing Objections To Report and Recommendation Of United States Magistrate Judge (Clerk's Document No. 130). The court, having reviewed the entire record and finding no plain error, accepts


and adopts the report and recommendation filed in this cause.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge filed in this cause (Clerk's Document No. 131) is hereby ACCEPTED AND ADOPTED by this court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendant (1) WALTER RANDALE RAMOS's term of supervised release is hereby REVOKED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendant (1) WALTER RANDALE RAMOS be imprisoned for TWELVE (12) months with no term of supervised release, and with credit for time-served. The Defendant shall be placed at the Bureau of Prison facility in either Bastrop or Forth Worth if possible.

Signed this 16th day of May, 2025.


ALAN D ALBRIGHT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE